

## REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 2-45 are pending in the application. Claims 2-3, 6-10, 14, 16-25, 28-30, 32, 34-37, 39, and 42-44 have been amended. Claim 1 has been cancelled. No claims have been newly added. Applicants believe that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and the following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 37 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the subject matter of any intervening claims. Office Action, Page 14.

Applicants note that claim 37 has been amended as indicated above to rewrite the claim in independent form, and further that independent claims 10, 16, and 23 have been amended to recite similar subject matter. Thus, independent claims 10, 16, 23, and 37 each recite subject matter that the Examiner has identified as allowable.

Applicants also note that claims 2-9, 11-15, 17-22, 24-36, and 38-45 each depend from and add features to one of independent claims 10, 16, 23, and 37. Thus, claims 2-9, 11-15, 17-22, 24-36, and 38-45 each recite allowable subject matter for at least the reason that they depend from independent claims that recite subject matter identified as allowable.

Accordingly, for at least the reason that all of the pending claims either recite subject matter that the Examiner has identified as allowable or depend from a claim that recites subject matter that the Examiner has identified as allowable, allowance of all of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

### CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to claims 23-25, 28-30, and 35 because of alleged informalities. In particular, the Examiner alleges that for "these claims, all instances that 'the terminal device' and 'the server' should instead be 'the at least one terminal device' and 'the at least one server respectively.'" Office Action, Page 2.

Solely for purposes of expediting prosecution of this application, and without acknowledging the propriety of the alleged basis for the objection, Applicants note that claims 23-25, 28-30, and 35 have been amended to recite the language suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants requests withdrawal of this objection.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-22, 33-34, and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the term "computer readable medium" previously recited in claims 10-22 and 33-34 "is not defined in the specification, thus the metes and bounds of the claims cannot be determined." In addition, the Examiner alleges that claim 39 "appears to either have missing words form [sic] the clause or be [sic] grammatically incorrect." Office Action, Pages 2-3.

Solely for purposes of expediting prosecution of this application, and without acknowledging the propriety of the alleged basis for the rejection, Applicants note that the claims have been amended as indicated above to further clarify the invention. Accordingly, for at least the reason that the amended claims fully address the issues of alleged indefiniteness raised by the Examiner, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-22 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the term "computer readable medium" previously recited in independent claims 10 and 16 "could broadly, but reasonably be interpreted to refer to signals," further alleging that a signal "per se does not fall within any of the four statutory categories of invention." Office Action, Pages 3-4.

Solely for purposes of expediting prosecution of this application, and without acknowledging the propriety of the alleged basis for the rejection, Applicants note that the claims have been amended as indicated above to further clarify the invention. Accordingly, for

at least the reason that the claims have been amended to recite a "computer device," which is clearly tied to another statutory class, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 7, 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 22-25, 27-36, and 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0166063 to Lachman, III et al. ("Lachman"). This rejection is improper for at least the reason that claims 1, 3, 7, 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 22-25, 27-36, and 42-43 each contain subject matter that the Examiner has identified as allowable.

More particularly, as discussed above, claim 37 has been amended to rewrite the claim in independent form, wherein the Examiner has indicated that claim 37 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and independent claims 10, 16, and 23 have been amended to recite similar subject matter. Dependent claims 3, 7, 9, 11, 13-15, 18-20, 22, 24-25, 27-36, and 42-43 each depend from and add features to one of independent claims 10, 16, 23, and 37.

Accordingly, for at least the reason that each of pending claims 1, 3, 7, 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 22-25, 27-36, and 42-43 either recite subject matter that the Examiner has identified as allowable or depend from a claim that recites subject matter that the Examiner has identified as allowable, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected each of claims 2, 4-6, 8, 12, 17, 21, 26, 38, and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable. In particular, the Examiner has rejected claims 2, 4-6, 12, 17, and 26 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lachman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,345 to Shetty ("Shetty"), claims 8 and 21 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lachman in view of "An Adaptive Security Model for Mobile Agents in Wireless Networks" to Alampalayam et al. ("Alampalayam"), and claims 38 and 44-45 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lachman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,886,099 to Smithson et al. ("Smithson"). Each of the foregoing rejections are improper for at least the reason that claims 2, 4-6, 8, 12, 17, 21, 26, 38, and 44-45 each contain subject matter that the Examiner has identified as allowable.

More particularly, as discussed above, claim 37 has been amended to rewrite the claim in independent form, wherein the Examiner has indicated that claim 37 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and independent claims 10, 16, and 23 have been amended to recite similar subject matter. Dependent claims 2, 4-6, 8, 12, 17, 21, 26, 38, and 44-45 each depend from and add features to one of independent claims 10, 16, 23, and 37.

Accordingly, for at least the reason that each of pending claims 2, 4-6, 8, 12, 17, 21, 26, 38, and 44-45 depend from a claim that recites subject matter that the Examiner has identified as allowable, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

## CONCLUSION


Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. As such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: April 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Syed Jafar Ali  
Registration No. 58,780

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
Main: 703-770-7900  
Direct: 703-770-7540  
Fax: 703-770-7901